arXiv:1410.2061v2 [math.CO] 7 Jan 2015

ON THE LARGEST SIZE OF $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-CORE PARTITIONS

HUAN XIONG

Abstract. In this paper we prove that Amdeberhan's conjecture on the largest size of $(t, t+1, t+2)$-core partitions is true. We also show that the number of $(t, t+1, t+2)$-core partitions with the largest size is 1 or 2 based on the parity of t. More generally, the largest size of $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partitions and the number of such partitions with the largest size are determined.

1. Introduction

In number theory and combinatorics, a *partition* is a finite weakly decreasing sequence of positive integers $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_r)$. Let $\mid \lambda \mid = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} \lambda_i$. The positive integer $\mid \lambda \mid$ is called the *size* of the partition λ. A partition λ could be represented by its Young diagram, which is a collection of boxes arranged in left-justified rows with λ_i boxes in the i-th row. For the (i, j)-box, we can associate its *hook length*, denoted by $h(i, j)$, which is the number of boxes exactly to the right, or exactly below, or the box itself. For example, the following are the Young diagram and hook lengths of the partition $(6, 4, 2)$.

8	7	5	4	2	1
5	4	2	1		
2	1				

Figure 1. The Young diagram of the partition $(6, 4, 2)$ and the hook lengths of corresponding boxes.

Let t be a positive integer. A partition is called a *t-core partition* if none of its hook lengths is divisible by t. For example, we can see that $\lambda = (6, 4, 2)$ is a 3-core partition from Figure 1. Furthermore, a partition is called a $(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_m)$-core partition if it is simultaneously a t_1-core, a t_2-core, ..., a t_m-core partition.

A number of methods, from several areas of mathematics, have been used in the study of t-core and $(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_m)$-core partitions. Granville and Ono [6] proved that for given positive integers n and $t \geq 4$, there always exists a t-core partition with size n. It was showed by Anderson [2] that the number of (t_1, t_2)-core partitions is $\frac{1}{t_1+t_2}\binom{t_1+t_2}{t_1}$ when t_1 and t_2 are coprime to each other. Recently, a result obtained by Olsson and Stanton [9] was that the largest size of (t_1, t_2)-core partitions is $\frac{({t_1}^2-1)({t_2}^2-1)}{24}$ when t_1 and t_2 are relatively prime.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05A17, 11P81.
Key words and phrases. partition; hook length; t-core; largest size.

But for general $(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_m)$-core partitions, what we know is quite few. We prove the following result, which verifies and generalizes the conjecture of Amdeberhan [1] on the largest size of $(t, t+1, t+2)$-core partitions:

Theorem 1.1. *Let t and p be positive integers. Suppose that $t = pn + d$, where $1 \leq d \leq p$ and $n \geq 0$. Then the largest size of $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partitions is*

$$\max\{\tbinom{n+2}{2}[\tfrac{d}{2}](d - [\tfrac{d}{2}]) + \tbinom{n+2}{3}(p^2n + pd - p^2) - 3\tbinom{n+2}{4}p^2,$$
$$\tbinom{n+1}{2}(p - [\tfrac{p-d}{2}])(d + [\tfrac{p-d}{2}]) + \tbinom{n+1}{3}(p^2n + pd - p^2) - 3\tbinom{n+1}{4}p^2\},$$

where $\max\{x,\ y\}$ denotes the maximal element in $\{x,\ y\}$. The number of $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partitions with the largest size is at most 4.

Corollary 1.2. *(Cf. Conjecture 11.2 of [1].) The largest size $g(t)$ of $(t, t+1, t+2)$-core partitions equals to:*

$$g(t) = \begin{cases} n\binom{n+1}{3}, & \text{if } t = 2n-1; \\ (n+1)\binom{n+1}{3} + \binom{n+2}{3}, & \text{if } t = 2n. \end{cases}$$

2. The β-sets of $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partitions

Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_r)$ be a partition whose corresponding Young diagram has r rows. The *β-set* of the partition λ is denoted by

$$\beta(\lambda) = \{h(i,1) : 1 \leq i \leq r\},$$

which is the set of hook lengths of boxes in the first column of the corresponding Young diagram. It is easy to see that $h(1,1) > h(2,1) > \cdots > h(r,1) > 0$ and thus $\beta(\lambda) \subseteq \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, h(1,1)\}$. Let $\beta(\lambda)'$ be the complement of $\beta(\lambda)$ in $\{0, 1, 2, \ldots, h(1,1)\}$ and $H(\lambda)$ be the multiset of hook lengths of λ. Then $\beta(\lambda) \subseteq H(\lambda)$. We know $0 \in \beta(\lambda)'$ since $0 \notin \beta(\lambda)$. It is easy to see that λ is a t-core partition if and only if $H(\lambda)$ doesn't contain any multiple of t. The following results are well-known and easy to prove:

Lemma 2.1. *([3]) The partition λ is uniquely determined by its β-set.*

(1) Suppose $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_r)$. Then $\lambda_i = h(i,1) - r + i$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$. Thus the size of λ equals to $\mid \lambda \mid = \sum_{x \in \beta(\lambda)} x - \binom{\#\beta(\lambda)}{2}$, where $\#\beta(\lambda)$ denotes the number of elements in $\beta(\lambda)$;

(2) $H(\lambda) = \{x - x' : x \in \beta(\lambda),\ x' \in \beta(\lambda)',\ x > x'\}$.

Remark. Any finite set of some positive integers could be a β-set of some partition. Actually, by Lemma 2.1, it is easy to see that, given any finite set S of some positive integers, we can recover a partition by considering S as a β-set. Then we know there is a bijection between partitions and finite sets of some positive integers.

Any finite positive integer set could be a β-set of some partition. But to be a β-set of some t-core partition, a finite positive integer set must satisfy the following condition.

Lemma 2.2. *A partition λ is a t-core partition if and only if for any $x \in \beta(\lambda)$ and any positive integer m with $x \geq mt$, we have $x - mt \in \beta(\lambda)$.*

Proof. $\Rightarrow$: Suppose that λ is a t-core partition, $x \in \beta(\lambda)$, m is a positive integer, and $x \geq mt$. By the definition of t-core partitions, we have $mt \notin H(\lambda)$ and thus $x > mt$. But we know $x - (x - mt) = mt \notin H(\lambda)$, $x \in \beta(\lambda)$, and $x > x - mt$.

Then by Lemma 2.1(2), $x - mt$ couldn't be an element in $\beta(\lambda)'$. Thus we know $x - mt \in \beta(\lambda)$.

$\Leftarrow$: Suppose that for any $x \in \beta(\lambda)$ and any positive integer m with $x \geq mt$, we have $x - mt \in \beta(\lambda)$. This means that for any such x and m we have $x - mt \notin \beta(\lambda)'$. Thus for any $x \in \beta(\lambda),\ x' \in \beta(\lambda)',\ x > x'$, we know $x - x'$ couldn't be a multiple of t. Then by Lemma 2.1(2) we know λ must be a t-core partition. □

Throughout this paper, let t and p be positive integers. We have the following lemmas.

Lemma 2.3. *Let k be a positive integer. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \{ \sum_{0\leq i\leq p} c_i(t+i) : c_i \in \boldsymbol{Z},\ c_i \geq 0\ (0 \leq i \leq p),\ \sum_{0\leq i\leq p} c_i = k\} \\ = \ & \{\ x \in \boldsymbol{Z} : kt \leq x \leq k(t+p)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Suppose that $c_i \in \mathbf{Z},\ c_i \geq 0\ (0 \leq i \leq p)$ and $\sum_{0\leq i\leq p} c_i = k$. Let $x = \sum_{0\leq i\leq p} c_i(t+i)$. It is easy to see that

$$kt = \sum_{0\leq i\leq p} c_i t \leq x \leq \sum_{0\leq i\leq p} c_i(t+p) = k(t+p).$$

On the other hand, suppose that $x \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $kt \leq x \leq k(t+p)$. We will show by induction that

$$x \in \{ \sum_{0\leq i\leq p} c_i(t+i) : c_i \in \mathbf{Z},\ c_i \geq 0\ (0 \leq i \leq p),\ \sum_{0\leq i\leq p} c_i = k\}.$$

First it is obvious that

$$kt \in \{ \sum_{0\leq i\leq p} c_i(t+i) : c_i \in \mathbf{Z},\ c_i \geq 0\ (0 \leq i \leq p),\ \sum_{0\leq i\leq p} c_i = k\}.$$

Suppose that for $kt < x \leq k(t+p)$ we already have $x - 1 = \sum_{0\leq i\leq p} c_i(t+i)$ for some $c_i \in \mathbf{Z},\ c_i \geq 0\ (0 \leq i \leq p)$ and $\sum_{0\leq i\leq p} c_i = k$. Now we have $c_p < k$ since $x - 1 < k(t+p)$. Then there must exist some $0 \leq i_0 \leq p-1$ such that $c_{i_0} \geq 1$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} x &= 1 + \sum_{0\leq i\leq p} c_i(t+i) \\ &= \sum_{0\leq i\leq p,\ i\neq i_0,\ i_0+1} c_i(t+i) + (c_{i_0}-1)(t+i_0) + (c_{i_0+1}+1)(t+i_0+1). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$x \in \{ \sum_{0\leq i\leq p} c_i(t+i) : c_i \in \mathbf{Z},\ c_i \geq 0\ (0 \leq i \leq p),\ \sum_{0\leq i\leq p} c_i = k\}.$$

Now we finish the induction and prove the lemma. □

Lemma 2.4. *Let λ be a $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partition. Suppose that $c_i \in \boldsymbol{Z}$ and $c_i \geq 0$ for $0 \leq i \leq p$. Then $\sum_{0\leq i\leq p} c_i(t+i) \notin \beta(\lambda)$.*

Proof. Let $k = \sum_{0\leq i\leq p} c_i$. We will prove this lemma by induction on k. If $k = 0$, we have $\sum_{0\leq i\leq p} c_i(t+i) = 0 \notin \beta(\lambda)$. Now assume that $k \geq 1$ and the result is true for $k-1$. Assume that the result is not true for k, i.e., there exist $c_i \in \mathbf{Z},\ c_i \geq 0\ (0 \leq i \leq p)$ such that $\sum_{0\leq i\leq p} c_i = k$ and $\sum_{0\leq i\leq p} c_i(t+i) \in \beta(\lambda)$.

Then there must exist some $0 \leq i_0 \leq p$ such that $c_{i_0} \geq 1$ since $\sum_{0\leq i\leq p} c_i = k \geq 1$. By Lemma 2.2,

$$\sum_{0\leq i\leq p} c_i(t+i) - (t+i_0) = \sum_{0\leq i\leq p,\ i\neq i_0} c_i(t+i) + (c_{i_0}-1)(t+i_0) \in \beta(\lambda)$$

since λ is a $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partition. But by assumption we know

$$\sum_{0\leq i\leq p,\ i\neq i_0} c_i(t+i) + (c_{i_0}-1)(t+i_0) \notin \beta(\lambda)$$

since $\sum_{0\leq i\leq p,\ i\neq i_0} c_i + (c_{i_0}-1) = k-1$, a contradiction! This means that we must have

$$\sum_{0\leq i\leq p} c_i(t+i) \notin \beta(\lambda)$$

for $c_i \in \mathbf{Z},\ c_i \geq 0\ (0 \leq i \leq p)$ and $\sum_{0\leq i\leq p} c_i = k$. We finish the induction. □

Let $[x]$ be the largest integer not greater than x. For $1 \leq k \leq [\frac{t+p-2}{p}]$, let

$$S_k = \{x \in \mathbf{Z} : (k-1)(t+p)+1 \leq x \leq kt-1\}.$$

Notice that for $1 \leq k \leq [\frac{t+p-2}{p}]$, $S_k \neq \emptyset$ since $(k-1)(t+p)+1 \leq kt-1$.

We have the following characterization for β-sets of $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partitions.

Lemma 2.5. *Let t and p be positive integers. Suppose that λ is a $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partition. Then $\beta(\lambda)$ must be a subset of $\bigcup_{1\leq k\leq [\frac{t+p-2}{p}]} S_k$.*

Proof. First we claim that for every $x \geq [\frac{t+p-2}{p}]t$, we have $x \notin \beta(\lambda)$:

Suppose $x \geq [\frac{t+p-2}{p}]t$. Then there must exist some $k \geq [\frac{t+p-2}{p}]$ such that $kt \leq x < (k+1)t$. Thus we know

$$kt \leq x \leq (k+1)t - 1 \leq kt + [\frac{t+p-2}{p}]p \leq k(t+p)$$

since $k \geq [\frac{t+p-2}{p}]$. By Lemma 2.3 we have

$$x \in \{\sum_{0\leq i\leq p} c_i(t+i) : c_i \in \mathbf{Z},\ c_i \geq 0\ (0 \leq i \leq p),\ \sum_{0\leq i\leq p} c_i = k\}.$$

Then by Lemma 2.4 we know $x \notin \beta(\lambda)$. The claim is proved.

Now we know $\beta(\lambda)$ must be a subset of $\{x \in \mathbf{Z} : 1 \leq x \leq [\frac{t+p-2}{p}]t - 1\}$. By Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 2.4 we have

$$\{\ x \in \mathbf{Z} : kt \leq x \leq k(t+p)\} \bigcap \beta(\lambda) = \emptyset$$

for every positive integer k. Hence $\beta(\lambda)$ must be a subset of

$$\{x \in \mathbf{Z} : 1 \leq x \leq [\frac{t+p-2}{p}]t - 1\} \setminus (\bigcup_{1\leq k\leq [\frac{t+p-2}{p}]-1} \{x \in \mathbf{Z} : kt \leq x \leq k(t+p)\}),$$

which equals to $\bigcup_{1\leq k\leq [\frac{t+p-2}{p}]} S_k$. □

By Lemma 2.5 and Lemma 2.1, the next result is obvious. We mention that, the following result is also a corollary of Theorem 1 in [2].

Corollary 2.6. *Let t and p be positive integers. Then the number of $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partitions must be finite.*

3. The largest size of $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partitions

Let λ be a $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partition. By Lemma 2.5, we know $\beta(\lambda) \subseteq \bigcup_{1\leq k\leq [\frac{t+p-2}{p}]} S_k$. Let $a_k = \#S_k$ be the number of elements in S_k and $b_{\lambda,k} = \#(\beta(\lambda)\bigcap S_k)$ be the number of elements in $\beta(\lambda)\bigcap S_k$ for $1 \leq k \leq [\frac{t+p-2}{p}]$. It is obvious that $b_{\lambda,k} \leq a_k$ for $1 \leq k \leq [\frac{t+p-2}{p}]$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $1 \leq k \leq [\frac{t+p-2}{p}]$. Then $a_k = t-(k-1)p-1$. Thus $1 \leq a_{[\frac{t+p-2}{p}]} \leq p$ and for $1 \leq k \leq [\frac{t+p-2}{p}]-1$, we have $a_k - a_{k+1} = p$. Additionally, for every $x \in S_{k+1}$ and $0 \leq i \leq p$, we have $x-(t+i) \in S_k$. Furthermore, $\bigcup_{1\leq k\leq [\frac{t+p-2}{p}]} S_k$ is a β-set of some $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partition.*

Proof. First we have

$$a_k = kt - 1 - ((k-1)(t+p)+1) + 1 = t-(k-1)p-1$$

for $1 \leq k \leq [\frac{t+p-2}{p}]$. Thus

$$1 \leq t - ([\frac{t+p-2}{p}]-1)p - 1 = a_{[\frac{t+p-2}{p}]} \leq t - (\frac{t+p-2-(p-1)}{p} - 1)p - 1 = p$$

and

$$a_k - a_{k+1} = t-(k-1)p-1-(t-kp-1) = p.$$

Suppose that $x \in S_{k+1}$ for $1 \leq k \leq [\frac{t+p-2}{p}]-1$. This means that

$$k(t+p)+1 \leq x \leq (k+1)t-1.$$

Thus for $0 \leq i \leq p$, we have

$$(k-1)(t+p)+1 \leq k(t+p)+1-(t+i) \leq x-(t+i) \leq (k+1)t-1-(t+i) \leq kt-1,$$

which means that $x-(t+i) \in S_k$. Then by Lemma 2.2 we know $\bigcup_{1\leq k\leq [\frac{t+p-2}{p}]} S_k$ must be a β-set of some $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partition. □

Lemma 3.2. *Let λ be a $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partition and $1 \leq k \leq [\frac{t+p-2}{p}]-1$. If $b_{\lambda,k+1} \neq 0$, then $b_{\lambda,k} - b_{\lambda,k+1} \geq p$.*

Proof. Suppose that $1 \leq k \leq [\frac{t+p-2}{p}]-1$ and $b_{\lambda,k+1} \neq 0$. Let

$$\beta(\lambda)\bigcap S_{k+1} = \{x_i : 1 \leq i \leq b_{\lambda,k+1}\}$$

where $x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_{b_{\lambda,k+1}}$. Then by Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 3.1 we know $\{x_1-(t+p), x_1-(t+p-1), \ldots, x_1-(t+1), x_1-t, x_2-t, \ldots, x_{b_{\lambda,k+1}}-t\} \subseteq \beta(\lambda)\bigcap S_k$ where $x_1-(t+p) < x_1-(t+p-1) < \cdots < x_1-(t+1) < x_1-t < x_2-t < \cdots < x_{b_{\lambda,k+1}}-t$. It follows that $\beta(\lambda)\bigcap S_k$ has at least $b_{\lambda,k+1}+p$ different elements and thus $b_{\lambda,k} \geq b_{\lambda,k+1}+p$. □

Let $1 \leq r \leq [\frac{t+p-2}{p}]$. Suppose that $c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_r$ are positive integers and $c_k \leq a_k$ for $1 \leq k \leq r$. Let $\mu_{c_1,c_2,\ldots,c_r}$ be the partition whose β-set satisfies

$$\beta(\mu_{c_1,c_2,\ldots,c_r}) \subseteq \bigcup_{1\leq k\leq r} S_k$$

and

$$\beta(\mu_{c_1,c_2,\ldots,c_r})\bigcap S_k = \{x \in \mathbf{Z} : kt - c_k \leq x \leq kt-1\}$$

for $1 \leq k \leq r$.

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose that $c_k \leq a_k$ for $1 \leq k \leq r$. The partition $\mu_{c_1,c_2,\ldots,c_r}$ is a $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partition if and only if $c_k - c_{k+1} \geq p$ for $1 \leq k \leq r-1$.*

Proof. Suppose that $1 \leq k \leq r-1$ and $x \in \beta(\mu_{c_1,c_2,\ldots,c_r}) \bigcap S_{k+1}$. This means that $(k+1)t - c_{k+1} \leq x \leq (k+1)t - 1$. Thus for $0 \leq i \leq p$, we have

$$(k+1)t - c_{k+1} - (t+p) \leq x - (t+i) \leq (k+1)t - 1 - t = kt - 1.$$

Then by Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 3.1 it is easy to see that $\mu_{c_1,c_2,\ldots,c_r}$ is a $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partition if and only if $kt - c_k \leq (k+1)t - c_{k+1} - (t+p)$ for $1 \leq k \leq r-1$, which is equivalent to $c_k - c_{k+1} \geq p$ for $1 \leq k \leq r-1$. □

Let $\gamma_i = \mu_{i,i-p,i-2p,\ldots,i-[\frac{i-1}{p}]p}$ and $f(i) = \mid \gamma_i \mid$ be the size of γ_i for $1 \leq i \leq t-1$. By Lemma 3.3 γ_i is a $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partition for $1 \leq i \leq t-1$. For convenience, let γ_0 be the empty partition and $f(0) = 0$.

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose that $1 \leq i \leq p$, $m \geq 0$ and $pm + i \leq t-1$. Then we have*
(1) $f(pm+i) - f(pm+i-1) = \binom{m+2}{2}(t - pm - 2i + 1)$;
(2) $f(pm+i) - f(pm) = \binom{m+2}{2}(it - ipm - i^2)$.

Proof. (1) First we know $\gamma_{pm+i} = \mu_{pm+i,p(m-1)+i,p(m-2)+i,\ldots,i}$ and

$$\#\beta(\gamma_{pm+i}) = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq m} (pj + i) = p\binom{m+1}{2} + (m+1)i.$$

Then by Lemma 2.1(1) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& f(pm+i) - f(pm+i-1) \\
= \; & \mid \gamma_{pm+i} \mid - \mid \gamma_{pm+i-1} \mid \\
= \; & \sum_{x \in \beta(\gamma_{pm+i})} x - \binom{\#\beta(\gamma_{pm+i})}{2} - \Big(\sum_{y \in \beta(\gamma_{pm+i-1})} y - \binom{\#\beta(\gamma_{pm+i-1})}{2} \Big) \\
= \; & \sum_{1 \leq k \leq m+1} (kt - p(m+1-k) - i) - \sum_{1 \leq k \leq m+1} (\#\beta(\gamma_{pm+i}) - k) \\
= \; & \frac{m+1}{2}((m+2)t - pm - 2i) - \sum_{1 \leq k \leq m+1} (p\binom{m+1}{2} + (m+1)i - k) \\
= \; & \frac{m+1}{2}((m+2)t - pm - 2i) - \frac{m+1}{2}(2p\binom{m+1}{2} + 2(m+1)i - m - 2) \\
= \; & \frac{m+1}{2}(m+2)(t - pm - 2i + 1) \\
= \; & \binom{m+2}{2}(t - pm - 2i + 1).
\end{aligned}$$

(2) By (1) we know

$$\begin{aligned}
f(pm+i) - f(pm) &= \sum_{1 \leq l \leq i} (f(pm+l) - f(pm+l-1)) \\
&= \sum_{1 \leq l \leq i} \binom{m+2}{2}(t - pm - 2l + 1) \\
&= \binom{m+2}{2}(it - ipm - i^2).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark. Notice that Lemma 3.4(2) is also true for $i = 0$.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $0 \le i \le p$ and $m \ge 0$. Suppose that $pm + i \le t - 1$. Then*

$$f(pm+i) = \binom{m+2}{2}(it - ipm - i^2) + \binom{m+2}{3}(pt - p^2) - 3\binom{m+2}{4}p^2.$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.4 we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(pm+i) &= f(pm+i) - f(pm) + \sum_{0\le k\le m-1} (f(pk+p) - f(pk)) \\ &= \binom{m+2}{2}(it - ipm - i^2) + \sum_{0\le k\le m-1} \binom{k+2}{2}(pt - p^2k - p^2) \\ &= \binom{m+2}{2}(it - ipm - i^2) + \binom{m+2}{3}(pt - p^2) - 3\binom{m+2}{4}p^2. \end{aligned}$$

In the above proof, we use the identities

$$k\binom{k+2}{2} = 3\binom{k+2}{3}$$

and

$$\sum_{0\le k\le m-1} \binom{k+n}{n} = \binom{n+m}{n+1}.$$

□

Now we prove our main result in this paper.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Suppose that λ is a $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partition with the largest size. By Lemma 2.5, we know $\beta(\lambda) \subseteq \bigcup_{1\le k\le [\frac{t+p-2}{p}]} S_k$. We will give some properties for such λ.

Step 1. Let r be the largest positive integer k such that $b_{\lambda,k} > 0$, i.e., $b_{\lambda,r} > 0$ and $b_{\lambda,k} = 0$ for $k > r$. We claim that $\lambda = \mu_{c_1,c_2,\ldots,c_r}$ for some positive integers $c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_r$ such that $c_k \le a_k$ for $1 \le k \le r$ and $c_k - c_{k+1} \ge p$ for $1 \le k \le r-1$:

First we know $b_{\lambda,k} - b_{\lambda,k+1} \ge p$ for $1 \le k \le r-1$ by Lemma 3.2. It follows that

$$kt - b_{\lambda,k} \le (k+1)t - b_{\lambda,k+1} - (t+p).$$

This means that for every

$$(k+1)t - b_{\lambda,k+1} \le x \le (k+1)t - 1,$$

we have

$$kt - b_{\lambda,k} \le x - (t+i) \le kt - 1$$

for $0 \le i \le p$. Thus by Lemma 2.2 we have $\bigcup_{1\le k\le r}\{x \in \mathbf{Z} : kt - b_{\lambda,k} \le x \le kt-1\}$ must be a β-set for some $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partition λ'. We can write

$$\beta(\lambda') = \bigcup_{1\le k\le r} \{x \in \mathbf{Z} : kt - b_{\lambda,k} \le x \le kt - 1\}.$$

Since $\{x \in \mathbf{Z} : kt - b_{\lambda,k} \le x \le kt-1\}$ is just the set of the largest $b_{\lambda,k}$ elements in S_k, we have

$$\sum_{x\in\beta(\lambda)\bigcap S_k} x \;\le\; \sum_{kt-b_{\lambda,k}\le x\le kt-1} x \;=\; \sum_{x\in\beta(\lambda')\bigcap S_k} x$$

for $1 \leq k \leq r$. Then we know

$$\mid \lambda \mid = \sum_{x \in \beta(\lambda)} x - \binom{\sum\limits_{1 \leq k \leq r} b_{\lambda,k}}{2} \leq \sum_{x \in \beta(\lambda')} x - \binom{\sum\limits_{1 \leq k \leq r} b_{\lambda,k}}{2} = \mid \lambda' \mid .$$

The above equality holds if and only if $\lambda = \lambda'$. Since we already assume that λ is a $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partition with the largest size, we must have $\lambda = \lambda'$ and thus

$$\beta(\lambda) \bigcap S_k = \{x \in \mathbf{Z} : kt - b_{\lambda,k} \leq x \leq kt - 1\}$$

for $1 \leq k \leq r$. Let $c_k = b_{\lambda,k}$ for $1 \leq k \leq r$. Then we have $\lambda = \mu_{c_1,c_2,\ldots,c_r}$, $c_k \leq a_k$ for $1 \leq k \leq r$ and $c_k - c_{k+1} \geq p$ for $1 \leq k \leq r-1$. We prove this claim.

Step 2. We claim that $1 \leq c_r \leq p$:

Otherwise, suppose that $c_r \geq p+1$. Then

$$r \leq [\frac{t+p-2}{p}] - 1$$

since

$$c_{[\frac{t+p-2}{p}]} \leq a_{[\frac{t+p-2}{p}]} \leq p.$$

Then we know $1 \leq a_{r+1}$. Thus we can define

$$\lambda' = \mu_{c_1,c_2,\ldots,c_r,1}.$$

By Lemma 3.3, λ' is a $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partition since $c_r - 1 \geq p$. It is easy too see that

$$\beta(\lambda') = \beta(\lambda) \bigcup \{(r+1)t - 1\}.$$

But by Lemma 2.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mid \lambda' \mid - \mid \lambda \mid &= \sum_{x \in \beta(\lambda')} x - \binom{\#\beta(\lambda')}{2} - (\sum_{y \in \beta(\lambda)} y - \binom{\#\beta(\lambda)}{2}) \\ &= (r+1)t - 1 - \#\beta(\lambda) > 0 \end{aligned}$$

since $(r+1)t-1$ is larger than any element in $\beta(\lambda)$. This contradicts the assumption that λ is a $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partition with the largest size. Then we must have $1 \leq c_r \leq p$.

Step 3. We claim that there is at most one integer i satisfying $1 \leq i \leq r-1$ and $c_i - c_{i+1} \neq p$:

Otherwise, suppose that $1 \leq i < j \leq r-1$ such that $c_i - c_{i+1} \neq p$ and $c_j - c_{j+1} \neq p$. It is easy to see that

$$c_{j+1} + 1 \leq c_j - p \leq a_j - p = a_{j+1}.$$

Then we can define

$$\lambda' = \mu_{c_1,c_2,\ldots,c_{i-1},c_i-1,c_{i+1},\ldots,c_j,c_{j+1}+1,c_{j+2},\ldots,c_r}.$$

By Lemma 3.3, λ' is a $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partition since $c_i - c_{i+1} \geq p+1$ and $c_j - c_{j+1} \geq p+1$. It is easy too see that

$$\beta(\lambda') = \beta(\lambda) \bigcup \{(j+1)t - c_{j+1} - 1\} \setminus \{it - c_i\}.$$

But by Lemma 2.1 we have

$$\mid \lambda' \mid - \mid \lambda \mid = (j+1)t - c_{j+1} - 1 - (it - c_i) \geq 2t + c_i - c_{j+1} - 1 > 0.$$

This contradicts the assumption that λ is a $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partition with the largest size. Then we prove the claim.

Step 4. We claim that if such i in Step 3 exists, then $c_i - c_{i+1} = p+1$:

Otherwise, suppose that $c_i - c_{i+1} \geq p+2$. It is easy to see that

$$c_{i+1} + 1 < c_i - p \leq a_i - p = a_{i+1}.$$

Then we can define

$$\lambda' = \mu_{c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_{i-1}, c_i - 1, c_{i+1}+1, c_{i+2}, \ldots, c_r}.$$

By Lemma 3.3, λ' is a $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partition since

$$(c_i - 1) - (c_{i+1} + 1) = c_i - c_{i+1} - 2 \geq p.$$

Notice that

$$\beta(\lambda') = \beta(\lambda) \bigcup \{(i+1)t - c_{i+1} - 1\} \setminus \{it - c_i\}.$$

By Lemma 2.1 we have

$$\mid \lambda' \mid - \mid \lambda \mid = (i+1)t - c_{i+1} - 1 - (it - c_i) = t + c_i - c_{i+1} - 1 > 0.$$

This contradicts the assumption that λ is a $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partition with the largest size. Then we prove the claim.

Step 5. We claim that such i in Step 4 couldn't exist, i.e., there is no such i satisfying $c_i - c_{i+1} = p+1$:

Otherwise, suppose that $c_i - c_{i+1} = p+1$. It is easy to see that

$$c_{i+1} + 1 = c_i - p \leq a_i - p = a_{i+1}.$$

Then we can define

$$\lambda' = \mu_{c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_i, c_{i+1}+1, c_{i+2}, \ldots, c_r}$$

and

$$\lambda'' = \mu_{c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_{i-1}, c_i - 1, c_{i+1}, \ldots, c_r}.$$

Then λ' and λ'' are also $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partitions by $c_i - c_{i+1} = p+1$ and Lemma 3.3. Notice that

$$\beta(\lambda') = \beta(\lambda) \bigcup \{(i+1)t - c_{i+1} - 1\}$$

and

$$\beta(\lambda'') = \beta(\lambda) \setminus \{it - c_i\}.$$

By Lemma 2.1 we have

$$\mid \lambda' \mid - \mid \lambda \mid = (i+1)t - c_{i+1} - 1 - \#\beta(\lambda) = (i+1)t - c_{i+1} - 1 - \sum_{1 \leq k \leq r} c_k$$

and

$$\mid \lambda \mid - \mid \lambda'' \mid = it - c_i - \#\beta(\lambda'') = it - c_i - (\sum_{1 \leq k \leq r} c_k - 1).$$

Put these two equalities together, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \mid \lambda \mid &= \mid \lambda' \mid + \mid \lambda'' \mid - (t + c_i - c_{i+1} - 2) \\ &= \mid \lambda' \mid + \mid \lambda'' \mid - (t + p - 1) \\ &< \mid \lambda' \mid + \mid \lambda'' \mid . \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts the assumption that λ is a $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partition with the largest size. Then we prove the claim.

Step 6. We claim that $\lambda \in \{\gamma_{t-j} : \ 1 \leq j \leq p\}$:

By Step 2, 3, 4, 5 we know $1 \leq c_r \leq p$ and $c_k - c_{k+1} = p$ for $1 \leq k \leq r-1$, which means that

$$\lambda = \mu_{c_1, c_1-p, c_1-2p, \ldots, c_1-[\frac{c_1-1}{p}]p} = \gamma_{c_1}.$$

Suppose that $c_1 = pm + i$, where $0 \leq i \leq p-1$ and $m \geq 0$. If $c_1 < t-p$, then γ_{c_1+1} is well defined and by Lemma 3.4 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mid \gamma_{c_1+1} \mid - \mid \lambda \mid &= \mid \gamma_{c_1+1} \mid - \mid \gamma_{c_1} \mid = f(c_1+1) - f(c_1) \\ &= f(pm+i+1) - f(pm+i) = \binom{m+2}{2}(t - pm - 2(i+1) + 1) \\ &= \binom{m+2}{2}(t - c_1 - i - 1) > \binom{m+2}{2}(p - i - 1) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This means that $c_1 < t-p$ implies $\mid \gamma_{c_1+1} \mid > \mid \lambda \mid$, which contradicts the assumption that λ is a $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partition with the largest size. Then we must have $c_1 \geq t-p$. But $c_1 \leq a_1 = t-1$, thus $\lambda \in \{\gamma_{t-j} : \ 1 \leq j \leq p\}$.

Step 7. By assumption we know $t = pn + d$, where $1 \leq d \leq p$ and $n \geq 0$. We claim that $\mid \lambda \mid = \max\{f(pn + [\frac{d}{2}]),\ f(pn - [\frac{p-d}{2}])\}$ and $\lambda \in \{\gamma_j : \ j = pn + [\frac{d}{2}],\ pn + [\frac{d}{2}] + 1,\ pn - [\frac{p-d}{2}],$ or $pn - [\frac{p-d}{2}] - 1\}$:

By Step 6 we know

$$\lambda \in \{\gamma_{pn+k} : \ 0 \leq k \leq d-1\} \bigcup \{\gamma_{pn-k} : \ 0 \leq k \leq p-d\}.$$

For γ_{pn+k} where $0 \leq k \leq d-1$, by Lemma 3.4 we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(pn+k) - f(pn) &= \binom{n+2}{2}(kt - kpn - k^2) \\ &= \binom{n+2}{2}(kd - k^2) \\ &= \binom{n+2}{2}(\frac{d^2}{4} - (k - \frac{d}{2})^2). \end{aligned}$$

Then it is easy to see that when d is even, $f(pn+k)$ is maximal for $0 \leq k \leq d-1$ if and only if $k = [\frac{d}{2}]$; when d is odd, $f(pn+k)$ is maximal for $0 \leq k \leq d-1$ if and only if $k = [\frac{d}{2}]$ or $[\frac{d}{2}] + 1$.

For γ_{pn-k} where $0 \leq k \leq p-d$, by Lemma 3.4 we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(pn) - f(pn-k) &= f(p(n-1)+p) - f(p(n-1)+p-k) \\ &= \sum_{p-k \leq l \leq p-1} (f(p(n-1)+l+1) - f(p(n-1)+l)) \\ &= \sum_{p-k \leq l \leq p-1} \binom{n+1}{2}(t - p(n-1) - 2(l+1) + 1) \\ &= \sum_{p-k \leq l \leq p-1} \binom{n+1}{2}(p + d - 2l - 1) \\ &= \binom{n+1}{2}(k^2 - k(p-d)) \\ &= \binom{n+1}{2}((k - \frac{p-d}{2})^2 - \frac{(p-d)^2}{4}). \end{aligned}$$

Then it is easy to see that when $p-d$ is even, $f(pn-k)$ is maximal for $0 \leq k \leq p-d$ if and only if $k = [\frac{p-d}{2}]$; when $p-d$ is odd, $f(pn-k)$ is maximal for $0 \leq k \leq p-d$ if and only if $k = [\frac{p-d}{2}]$ or $[\frac{p-d}{2}]+1$. Then we prove the claim.

Step 8. By Step 7 and Lemma 3.5 we have the largest size of $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partitions is

$$\max\{f(pn + [\frac{d}{2}]),\ f(pn - [\frac{p-d}{2}])\},$$

which equals to

$$\begin{array}{c}\max\{\binom{n+2}{2}[\frac{d}{2}](d-[\frac{d}{2}]) + \binom{n+2}{3}(p^2n+pd-p^2) - 3\binom{n+2}{4}p^2, \\ \binom{n+1}{2}(p-[\frac{p-d}{2}])(d+[\frac{p-d}{2}]) + \binom{n+1}{3}(p^2n+pd-p^2) - 3\binom{n+1}{4}p^2\}.\end{array}$$

By Step 7 we also know the number of $(t, t+1, \ldots, t+p)$-core partitions with the largest size is at most 4. We finish the proof. □

For $p = 1$, we have the following corollary. We mention that, this corollary could be obtained by results on the largest size of (t_1, t_2)-core partitions in [9].

Corollary 3.6. *The largest size of $(t, t+1)$-core partition is $\binom{t+2}{4}$. The number of $(t, t+1)$-core partitions with the largest size is 1.*

Proof. By Step 6 of Theorem 1.1, we know γ_{t-1} is the only $(t, t+1)$-core partition with the largest size since $p = 1$ in this case.

By Lemma 3.5 the largest size is

$$\mid \gamma_{t-1} \mid = f(t-1) = \binom{t+1}{3}(t-1) - 3\binom{t+1}{4} = \binom{t+2}{4}.$$

□

For $p = 2$, we have the following corollary, which shows that Amdeberhan's conjecture on the largest size of $(t, t+1, t+2)$-core partitions proposed in [1] is true.

Corollary 3.7. ***(1)*** *If $t = 2n-1$, the largest size of $(2n-1, 2n, 2n+1)$-core partition is $n\binom{n+1}{3}$. The number of $(2n-1, 2n, 2n+1)$-core partitions with the largest size is 2.*

(2) *If $t = 2n$, the largest size of $(2n, 2n+1, 2n+2)$-core partition is $(n+1)\binom{n+1}{3} + \binom{n+2}{3}$. The number of $(2n, 2n+1, 2n+2)$-core partitions with the largest size is 1.*

Proof. By Step 6 of Theorem 1.1, we know a $(t, t+1, t+2)$-core partition with the largest size must be γ_{t-1} or γ_{t-2} since $p = 2$ in this case.

(1) When $t = 2n-1$, by Lemma 3.4 we have

$$\mid \gamma_{t-1} \mid - \mid \gamma_{t-2} \mid = f(2n-2) - f(2n-3) = \binom{n}{2}(t - 2(n-2) - 4 + 1) = 0.$$

Then we get $f(2n-2) = f(2n-3)$. This means that γ_{2n-2} and γ_{2n-3} are the only two $(2n-1, 2n, 2n+1)$-core partitions with the largest size. By Lemma 3.5 the largest size is

$$\begin{array}{rcl} f(2n-2) & = & f(2(n-1)) \\ & = & \binom{n+1}{3}(2(2n-1)-4) - 12\binom{n+1}{4} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \binom{n+1}{3}(4n-6-3(n-2)) \\ &= n\binom{n+1}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

(2) When $t=2n$, by Lemma 3.4 we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\,\gamma_{t-1}\,| - |\,\gamma_{t-2}\,| &= f(2n-1)-f(2n-2) \\ &= \binom{n+1}{2}(t-2(n-1)-2+1) \\ &= \binom{n+1}{2} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

This means that γ_{2n-1} is the only $(2n, 2n+1, 2n+2)$-core partition with the largest size. By Lemma 3.5 the largest size is

$$\begin{aligned} f(2n-1) &= f(2(n-1)+1) \\ &= \binom{n+1}{2}(2n-2(n-1)-1)+\binom{n+1}{3}(4n-4)-12\binom{n+1}{4} \\ &= \binom{n+1}{2}+\binom{n+1}{3}(4n-4)-3\binom{n+1}{3}(n-2) \\ &= \binom{n+1}{2}+(n+2)\binom{n+1}{3} \\ &= \binom{n+1}{2}+\binom{n+1}{3}+(n+1)\binom{n+1}{3} \\ &= (n+1)\binom{n+1}{3}+\binom{n+2}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

□

4. Acknowledgements

We'd like to thank Prof. P. O. Dehaye for the helpful conversations and discussions. The author is supported by Forschungskredit of the University of Zurich, grant no. [FK-14-093].

References

[1] T. Amdeberhan, Theorems, problems and conjectures, 2013. Published electronically at www.math.tulane.edu/∼tamdeberhan/conjectures.pdf.
[2] J. Anderson, Partitions which are simultaneously t_1- and t_2-core, Disc. Math. 248(2002), 237−243.
[3] C. Berge, Principles of Combinatorics, Mathematics in Science and Engineering Vol. 72, Academic Press, New York, 1971.
[4] F. Chung and J. Herman, Some results on hook lengths, Discrete Math. 20(1977), 33 − 40.
[5] F. Garvan, D. Kim, and D. Stanton, Cranks and t-cores, Inv. Math. 101(1990), 1 − 17.
[6] A. Granville and K. Ono, Defect zero p-blocks for finite simple groups, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 348(1996), 331 − 347.
[7] H. Xiong, The number of simultaneous core partitions, arXiv:1409.7038[math.CO], 2014.
[8] G. James and A. Kerber, The Representation Theory of the Symmetric Group, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, MA, 1981.
[9] J. Olsson and D. Stanton, Block inclusions and cores of partitions, Aequationes Math. 74(1 − 2)(2007), 90 − 110.
[10] D. Stanton, Open positivity conjectures for integer partitions, Trends Math. 2(1999), 19−25.

I-Math, Universität Zürich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, Zürich 8057, Switzerland
E-mail address: huan.xiong@math.uzh.ch